

forgets / TR  
1-28-07

DE

- Have a ball done  
on colligens to use  
arcs

TR - have a law -  
but also upward  
on other crims, because  
GWB is the most

see IVSPDs Bank Admin

1-28-07

Hyp: add to

"Don't attack him"  
("unless he attacks")

- and don't use  
another weapon  
against him (no  
unless) under any  
circumstances

[ "unless authorized by  
Congress" ]

add -

401.14

Walter D. ... N.C.

J Heise:

We must give up  
all internal and  
in Iraq  
pull-out and ~~that~~  
region

JH - Sunni attack  
Shia because Shia  
are supporters of US  
Shia retaliate

Real  
Heats that aircraft  
carries +  
are carrying news  
(vs. GHWB policy)  
and that B-61 and 110  
are in forward  
("threat"/bluff?)

in Feb ~, 2006  
America + then  
Heard

March 29, 1993

It is general US policy -  
Feb 2006 - "In general, it is

In general, it is  
US policy not to deploy  
over several surface  
ships, naval aircraft...

Mark del Valle  
832-725-6275

4:15

1-24-07

## NUC WAR + AGGRESSION

- So say nuc weapons "have no legal function"  
(or practical effect: "useless") other than  
det of nuc attack

is absurd? In light of poss. of  
preemption (D-L)

or in preemption: from (Bad)

(in light of 9-11:

us. underground facilities

that might facilitate

giving nucs to terrorists,

or (further) giving nucs to

perhaps bad  
non-nuc "aggression"  
(by UN standards;



as in case of  
"frontier riots")

and, esp. NWE  
facilities, esp. unmanned,  
(or distant, many:  
SU in 1950's)

extensive front

(or back up countries  
attacks, direct Israeli  
NWE attack);  
or, attack US oil  
installations in ME with  
non-NWE attack;

"can't wait for nuclear cloud"

- as front of D-L:

little  
coldest.  
change



- Araks at sea

- satellites

- ~~the~~

and see threats in desert: Israeli wars  
1967, 1972

Targets for D-L:

Kelb War 1991

~~Albania~~ early Missiles

bombing

(air defenses, in '50's

C<sup>3</sup>

BMEWS + warning sats

for some cities;

or "high-level bomb."

1-24-07

BUT: Could SIOP be justified as D-L?  
(?)

Falk: City-busting? (non-use - WWI: local  
or retail?)

What if: non-pir cities:

- air defenses (50's)

- C<sup>3</sup>

- missiles

- airports:

(see C-II, US)

- sub bases (Kingrock:

Frederick)

MCN did not have plans / maps

on MAD: "pure intel, det"! :

- D-L vs. SU (or US) may be impossible, since



1964-68 - 72

(though new de-cap!)

~~But~~ BUT what if US (or SU) vs.

others: China (along with BMD)

NIK

(Pol!)

Iran

and others vs. each other?

~~Does UN Charter~~

What of plans for 'EU' - against military  
targets ("aggressors")

NATO

Armed

- Illegal, vs. military targets?

Pol

- Could be banned: but

new, Russia

is it?

Iran & others

- Promotion, (acc.) in non-we  
conflict?

1-24-07

Does UN Charter confront, deal with,  
or ignore

Aggression by Perm 5 ?!

SU in Afghanistan

(UK in Iraq!)

Coalition in  
Iraq!

see Wilkinson

Holmes

(not, ? VN

(Were SVN + NVN ever admitted to UN  
as sovereign states ?!



If so, was not IVVN guilty of  
"count aggression"?

What is basis of calling US not illegal?

French?

aggression?

(ICC is a mockery, with US not of  
it(?))

What of other Pans 5?

or, "Anti Pans"?

Was US being of Korea cities legal: or...?

If US had used area in Korea?

OR OTHER CASES OF THREATS?!

(SU in C-II, FROBS?  
IVATO?)